

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant	Bjarne Pedersen
Application No. 10/573,643	Filing Date: February 28, 2007
Title of Application:	Method Of Conducting Service On A Wind Turbine Using Equipment Mounted On The Hub
Confirmation No. 5543	Art Unit: 4176
Examiner	Jacob James Cigna

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Election Pursuant to Restriction Requirement**

This is a response to the outstanding Office Action dated September 24, 2009.

Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group II, claims 4-23, for prosecution in this case with traverse.

The Examiner states that the technical feature common to Groups I-III is a hub for a wind turbine mounted on a wind turbine, and a crane connected to the hub, the crane used for lowering and hoisting wind turbine appliances to and from the hub, and that this technical feature is taught by Hehenberger. (See 09/24/09 Office Action p. 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The common technical feature recited in claim 1 is, “**mounting** of servicing equipment including a crane on the **hub** of the wind turbine. The common technical feature recited in claim 4 is, “means for primarily **securing the equipment**, including the crane, to the **hub**. The common technical feature recited in claim 24 is, “means for primarily **securing the equipment**, including the crane, to the **hub**.”

Hehenberger teaches a winch and pivotable rod system attached to the machine frame of a wind turbine. “To this end, a winch (26) and a pivotable rod system (28, 29) with a guide roller (36) are mounted on the wind power arrangement, preferably on the

machine frame (22).” Hehenberger further states rotor hub (19) is mounted on the machine frame (22). (See Hehenberger Abstract). However, the winch and pivotable rod system are not mounted on the rotor hub; they are mounted directly to the arrangement itself, or to the machine frame.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “mounting of servicing equipment including a crane on the hub of the wind turbine.” As Hehenberger does not mount the winch and pivotable rod system on the rotor hub, it does not teach the above limitation of claim 1. As this is the common technical feature of claims 1, 4 and 24, Applicant submits that Groups I, II, and III have both a common technical feature, and said technical feature is not disclosed by Hehenberger. Thus, Applicants submits that Groups I, II, and II provide contribution in the art and do have an inventive unity. As such, Groups I, II, and III should be examined in unison.

Respectfully submitted,

October 20, 2009

/Richard J. Basile/

Richard J. Basile, Registration No. 40,501  
Todd M. Oberdick, Registration No. 44,268  
Attorneys for Applicant  
ST.ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC  
986 Bedford Street  
Stamford, CT 06905-5619  
203 324-6155